

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 20-29 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by, for example, Figures 3 and 4 and paragraph [0013] of the Published Application. Claim 26 has been amended to correct an informality.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Action mailed July 21, 2010. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Action, claim 26 is objected to for depending on a cancelled claim. Claim 26 has been amended rendering this objection moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

On pages 2-4 of the Action, claims 1, 3-5, and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,245,652 to Larson et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Larson") in view of Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0195798 to Goci et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Goci"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that Larson in view of Goci does not teach or suggest claim 1, as amended, for at least the following reason.

Larson does not teach or suggest an "input unit [that] is operative to receive a list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable from the computer unit and to display the list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable; wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a first displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable and is operative to assign a first transmitter code for a first transmitter to be the same as the selected first displayed receiver code, wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a second displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from

which the receiver codes are selectable and assigns a second transmitter code for a second transmitter to be the same as the selected second displayed receiver code,” as recited in claim 1.

In rejecting claim 1, the Action relies on the ability to program the electric keys 14 of Larson to expire to teach the recited “receiv[ing] a user selection of a first displayed receiver code,” and “receiv[ing] a user selection of a second displayed receiver code.” Action, pgs. 2 and 3 (citing col. 36, l. 43-51 and Fig. 1, reference numerals 12 and 14 of Larson). Additionally, the Action also relies on the identification data of Larson to teach the recited “receiver codes” and “transmitter codes.” Action, pg. 3 (citing col. 37, l. 64 through col. 38, l. 5). Applicants disagree.

In contrast to claim 1, Larson discloses a lockbox system 10 which includes one or more lockboxes 12, which contain the key to a dwelling, and electronic keys 14, used by agents to open the lockbox 12 and retrieve the key to the dwelling. Larson, col. 3, l. 55-57 and Fig. 1.

Each key 14 is activated by the purchaser of the key 14, such as an agency or board and is loaded, via computer 18 and stand 16, with identification information, such as a serial number that identifies the agent the key 14 is associated with as well as the agency and board who owns the key 14, the agent’s personal access code, and a collection of lockbox access codes. Larson, col. 5, l. 18-27, col. 6, l. 63-67, col. 7, l. 1-5, and col. 37, l. 35-61. This information is loaded via a recharacterization program on computer 18 which interrogates the user using a menu display format on computer 18. Larson, col. 9, l. 11-25.

The owner of each key may retain this identification information and use it to prevent keys 14 from being fraudulently duplicated. Larson, col. 37, l. 64 through col. 38, l. 17. In particular, the computer 18 will not load a key with identification information if that identification information is already assigned to another key 14. *Id.*

Additionally, the owner of key 14 may program it to occasionally expire and require rejuvenation. Larson, col. 36, l. 43-61. In order be rejuvenated, the agent in possession of the key 14 would have to reconnect the key 14 to the owner’s computer 18.

In order to use a key 14 which has already been programmed, an agent must enter a four digit personal code into key 14. Larson, col. 10, l. 1-10. If this personal code matches the personal code that was loaded into in memory 56 of the key 14 by computer 18, the user may be prompted to select a function on the lockbox 12. *Id.* If the requested function is to open the lockbox, the key’s

14 CPU 52 compares the access codes stored in the key 14 with the access codes stored in the lockbox 12. Larson, col. 24, l. 47 through col. 25, l. 2. If the code access code is not expired, the key 14 will send lockbox 12 a signal instructing the lockbox to open. *Id.*

However, assuming for the sake of argument, that Larson discloses an input unit (e.g., computer 18), Larson does not disclose “receiv[ing] a list of codes,” “display[ing] the list of codes,” “receiv[ing] a user selection of a first displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes[,] and assign[ing] a first transmitter code for a first transmitter to be the same as the selected first displayed receiver code,” and “receiv[ing] a user selection of a second displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes[,] and assign[ing] a second transmitter code for a second transmitter to be the same as the selected second displayed receiver code,” as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Larson merely discloses an owner of key 14 loading the key 14 with an agent’s personal access code, a collection of lockbox access codes, an expiration date, and identification data via a menu display on computer 18. Larson, col. 5, l. 18-27, col. 6, l. 63-67, col. 7, l. 1-5, col. 9, l. 11-25, and col. 37, l. 35-61. However, while it briefly mentions that the computer 18 utilizes a “menu display format,” Larson does not provide any details as to how the menu display actually functions or what, if anything, is actually displayed to a user. For example, Larson does not disclose, teach, or suggest whether expiration dates and/or identification data (which the Action has aligned with the “receiver codes” and “transmitter codes,” of claim 1) are displayed to a user, selected by a user, and/or assigned to a first or a second transmitter through the “menu display format.”

Thus, Larson’s **generic disclosure of a menu display format** does not disclose, teach, or suggest “**receiv[ing]** a list of codes,” “**display[ing]** the list of codes,” “**receiv[ing]** a user selection of a first displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes,” “**assign[ing]** a first transmitter code for **a first transmitter** to be the same as the selected first displayed receiver code,” “**receiv[ing]** a user selection of a second displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes,” and “**assign[ing]** a second transmitter code for **a second transmitter** to be the same as the selected second displayed receiver code,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Larson does not disclose, teach, or suggest “input unit [that] is operative to receive a list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable from the computer unit and to

display the list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable; wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a first displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable and is operative to assign a first transmitter code for a first transmitter to be the same as the selected first displayed receiver code, wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a second displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable and assigns a second transmitter code for a second transmitter to be the same as the selected second displayed receiver code” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Goci fails to overcome the deficiencies of Larson. In particular, while Goci discloses displaying a list of candidates on a display, allowing a user to make a selection, and deactivating a selection on a display screen once a user has selected it (Goci, paragraph [0024]), Goci does not disclose, teach, or suggest “input unit [that] is operative to receive a list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable from the computer unit and to display the list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable; wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a first displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable and is operative to assign a first transmitter code for a first transmitter to be the same as the selected first displayed receiver code, wherein the input unit is operative to receive a user selection of a second displayed receiver code from the displayed list of codes from which the receiver codes are selectable and assigns a second transmitter code for a second transmitter to be the same as the selected second displayed receiver code,” as recited in claim 1.

Dependent claims 3-5 and 20-28 depend on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claims 3-5 and 20-28 be withdrawn and that claims 3-5 and 20-28 be allowed.

On page 5 of the Action, claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson in view of Goci and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,696,918 to Kucharczyk et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Kucharczyk”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dependent claim 29 depends on claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn and that claim 29 be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated:

10/21/10

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Robert Kirberg

Registration No.: 26,924

Kyle D. Petaja

Registration No.: 60,309

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicants

#1092979v1